WHO HAVE VIOLATED COMPROMISES.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN HICKMAN,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, December 12, 1859.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.
Stereotyped by Blanchard's Patent, issued February 22, 1859.
1859.

Speech of Mr. Hickman.

The *Constitution* newspaper, the organ of Mr. Buchanan's Administration, having charged upon the Anti-Lecompton Democracy a bargain with the Republicans to effect an organization of the House—

Mr. HICKMAN said:

Mr. Clerk, with regard to the attack made by the President's newspaper on myself and others, I have but a word to say. If made by the President himself, he knows it to be false. If made by any other person, he does not know it to be true; for, sir, the reason why I occupy the position here to-day which I do occupy, is because I could not be purchased. [Applause from the Republican benches and from the galleries.] This reading me out of the Democratic party has been faithfully persevered in for the last four years, by many abler and stronger than the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. NOELL,] and still they have not yet got rid of me, and it will take them perhaps four years longer of persevering effort, if I shall choose to remain so long in their good company.

My "treason," to which very frequent reference has been made here, not merely during the present session, but during former ones, has a history connected with it—a history with which the gentleman from Missouri ought to be acquainted. Sir, it dates back four years, when, in this Hall, on the grievous charge being made—a charge which pervaded the country, and which was believed by the country—that fraud and force and all manner of crimes had so far invaded the Territory of Kansas that they had prostrated thoroughly the people, I chose to introduce a resolution to investigate that charge. That was the time when my treason commenced, for I then took the stand against an undivided Democracy; and, sir, I charge on that undivided Democracy, from whom I do dissent to-day—not, however, because I have failed to be a Democrat—a persevering effort, both in this Hall and in the other wing of the Capitol, to stifle that investigation and to suppress the proof of the fraud. Then, sir, I was read from the Democratic party; and yet, after the committee, which I was, to some extent, instrumental in raising, (and this is the first time I have ever referred to it,) had made their report to Congress, no man in the country was sufficiently reckless to deny that the charge which had been preferred was fully and completely proved. Then, sir, I was denounced as a renegade and a traitor, and for what? What was the body of my offence? Because I chose to differ from the Democracy, believing that the charge ought to be investigated, and that, if fraud existed, it ought to be revealed. And have they ever washed their hands of it to this day? No, sir; to no greater extent than silence may have done it.

Well, sir, I returned home to my people with all the brand of treason which that body of men could place upon my forehead; and Mr. Buchanan, the present President of the United States, endorsed my Democracy in the face of that accusation which had gone up against me, and insisted on

But, sir, the North charge, further, that in the compromise of 1832—the great compromise of the great compromiser—Northern trade was paralyzed, and Northern industry destroyed. And then, sir, last, and not by any means least, we have the compromises of 1850 and 1854, which I choose to join together, as they constitute but one single compact. After we bought—yes, sir, after we bought California into the Union, giving to the South monstrous prerogatives, which I will not undertake now to enumerate, they made us the solemn guaranty that if we would adopt the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, to leave the whole question of Slavery to the final determination of the people of the Territory, and exclude all agitation of the Slavery question from Congress, they would abide by it. Now, sir, where are we? Who is there that represents that Southern sentiment of 1850 and 1854, upon this floor? Who is there that represents it? Is there any Southern member who represents it? It is likely that there is. If there be, however, he has maintained a most respectful silence up to this moment. No, sir; the Southern sentiment destroys all the benefits which the North were to reap from the compromise of 1850 and 1854. I will not undertake to say what the motive of the gentleman was who introduced the Kansas-Nebraska bill, but I think that no man ought to have doubted what the effect of that bill would be. The South undoubtedly expected that it would conduce to the interest of Slavery, and the effort was strenuously made, I think, in Kansas, to force that benefit from the main provision of the bill. But from the moment that it failed to plant Slavery in Kansas, it has been repudiated; and if I understand the position which the South occupy to-day, it is that they will have nothing to do with this thing of squatter sovereignty. They bitterly despise and denounce it.

Now, here is the first, the second, the third, the fourth, and the fifth compromise which the North has entered into with the South upon this all-absorbing subject of Slavery; and the North charge upon the South, that, in every single instance of compromise, they have violated its sanctity, after having received the benefit, or tried to receive the benefit, arising from their side of the bargain. And these charges have to be answered—not here, merely, but at other times and other places. They will have to be answered next year, and I assume now the position that the South have got to satisfactorily explain these things, or they have got to give up the Federal offices. [Applause and cries of "Good" upon the Republican side.] Now, the South have rights, guarantied under the Constitution; but the South have not all the rights. The North have a few. Individually, I would not withhold from the South, or from any portion of the South, the least, as I would not the greatest right, guarantied to her either by fundamental law or statute. I would treat her as I would treat a younger sister; I would give her more than she is entitled to, rather than less, because she is the weaker party. I would bestow bounties, even, upon her; but when she comes here, or anywhere else, and demands, as a right, what is not her right, and seeks to wrest from the North what she is not entitled to, I would deny her. That is my position, and those are my principles at the present time; for if I understand the politics of the country, if I have not been blinded for the last four years, there are no politics in the United States now but "nigger." The whole politics of the country are involved in the negro question. Shall Slavery travel into the Territories, or shall it not? that is the question. There is no other question, and there will be no other question in the Presidential contest of 1860; and if I am constrained to choose between the party which insists that Slavery shall travel everywhere, against right, and that party which says it shall not go anywhere, even when it has a right, I cannot help it. That is all. I stand upon the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. I believe it is sufficient for us. It is anyhow the bond between the North and the South, and I will try it a little further, and I am with the men who are for that principle. I know how it will result. It will result exactly where the Republicans desire it should end; it will end in the exclusion of Slavery from all the Territories of the United States. If there is any man who is committed to the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, who does not answer that question in that way when it is propounded to him, all I have to say is, that he is either wilfully blind or slightly dishonest.

Sir, I have never uttered a political sentiment in my life, that I can remember,

that I would not utter here, in the hearing of the South—not one. I have always stood by the Democratic party, when I believed it to be right. I adhere to the principles of the Democratic party; and I have always opposed that party when I believed it to be wrong, and I intend to do so forever. There shall not be any misunderstanding between any gentlemen upon the Democratic side of the House and myself. I feel perfectly certain that the party has been bankrupted by this Administration of James Buchanan. I know it. I know it; for whenever the Democratic party can no longer control Northern masses, then that party is bankrupt; and that is the condition of that party to-day. There is not a Northern State, not one, as there is scarcely a Northern county, that can be carried upon the doctrine upon which Mr. Buchanan this day bases his Administration. I want the party to put itself exactly right at Charleston; and, if it will not put itself right, I want it to put itself plainly wrong. I do not want the people, either of the North or of the South, to be deceived by any platform which can be interpreted in one way in one section and in another way in another section. If it is the sentiment of the Democratic party that Slavery shall travel with the column of our advancing civilization, I say, put it so before the people, express it plainly, and receive the Northern verdict upon it.

I should have said something about Union meetings at the North, but my friend from New York [Mr. HASKIN] has rendered that entirely unnecessary. I say this, which will cover everything I should have said at greater length: that there is no sentiment now in the North which can plant itself upon Southern policy, as I understand it, and live; for the reason that it would be governed by selfish considerations. And if this condition of things existing between the North and South shall lead to a dissolution of this Union, which no one would deplore more than I should; all I can say is, the North, under those circumstances, will endeavor to take care of themselves. I have never seen a Northern man, in latter times, that was much scared. I know many men have been alarmed, in times past, at the cries of dissolution; but I have never yet seen a Northern man who expressed any alarm as to the results of a dissolution of the Union. I will state what my conviction is on the subject. I do not know, however, that I thoroughly understand what is meant by a dissolution of the Union. If it means a dividing line of sentiment between the North and South, and virtual non-intercourse, why we have reached that dissolution already; for Northern men cannot now travel in the South; and, as I understand it, any postmaster in any village of the South, where the receipts of the office would not amount to five dollars, can, if a letter bearing my frank goes into his hands, open it, examine it, and burn it, on the pretext that it is incendiary. Sir, we have reached that dividing line between the North and the South. But, if dissolution means that there is to be a division of territory, by Mason and Dixon's line, or by any other line, I say "no;" that will never be. I express my opinion—and that opinion may go before the country, whether false or true—when I say "no;" the North will never tolerate a division of the territory. [Applause from the Republican benches.]

Mr. GARTRELL. I should like to know how you are to prevent it.

Mr. HICKMAN. I will tell you how it will be prevented. I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; but I express my belief that there is as much true courage in the North, though it may not be known by the name of chivalry, [sensation,] as there is in the South. I do not use the word contemptuously, for I admire true chivalry everywhere. There is as much true courage at the North as there is at the South. I always believed it, and, therefore, I will express it; and I believe, sir, that with all the appliances of art to assist, eighteen millions of men reared to industry, with habits of the right kind, will always be able to cope successfully, if it need be, with eight millions of men without these auxiliaries. [Great sensation, some applause from the Republican benches and the galleries, and hisses in other parts of the Hall.]

Mr. LEAKE. Will the gentleman permit me to propound to him a respectful interrogatory?

Mr. HICKMAN. I am up now, answering an interrogatory. I am answering why I am not a rascal. [Laughter and applause.] That is the main interrogatory.

I am sorry, sir, to trouble the House with these remarks. I entered this Hall

on Monday with the firm determination that I would not be dragged into a speech. I found that it was impossible to maintain that determination, that attacks were to be made incessantly, continuously; attacks, too, that could not be passed over in silence. I have answered them. There is no charge resting upon me of corruption, either here or at home. If there had been any there, it would have been exposed long before this. I have passed between raking fires there, as I have here. My colleague [Mr. FLORENCE] smiles, for he knows something about it. If the charge could have been made, it would have been made and proven; and, therefore, I do not want any charge to be made against me here by any gentleman on this floor, much less by a contemptible, hoodwinked newspaper, at the other end of the avenue, which has not as much circulation as a decent Northern village journal, when they have discovered nothing to found a charge upon.